

[UNFINISHED WORK—A BLUE BOOK FOR THE HUSTINGS—CHIEFLY COM-
PILED FROM BLUE BOOKS—IMPERIAL, COLONIAL, AND UNITED STATES.]

A HOME MARKET FOR THE FARMER, OUR BEST RECIPROCITY.

BRITAIN THE COUNTRY,

VERSUS

BRITAIN THE EMPIRE.

OUR MONETARY DISTRESSES—THEIR
LEGISLATIVE CAUSE AND CURE.

"If political economy is against us, then are we against political economy."—*Late speech of a Working Man in Hyde Park.*

"This that they call 'organizing of labor' is, if well understood, the problem of the whole future for all who will pretend to govern men."—THOMAS CARLYLE.

"Peelism seems altogether incapable of seeing that in all countries the goodness or popularity of a government is just in the proportion that it sides with the labor, as opposed to the money power—seeing that to the moneyed class the monetary distress of the country is prosperity—low wages, or want of employment, and high-priced money being convertible terms, and vice versa."—From an article of ISAAC BUCHANAN, in the "Glasgow Examiner," of 4th November, 1848.

"Tentanda via est, qua me quoque possim,

Tollere humo.—VIRGIL.

"Canada, too, must independently attempt something, must strike out some path or method, by which she may raise herself from the ground—by which she may rise into celebrity—by which she may soar aloft."

DEDICATED TO HIS CONSTITUENTS,

BY ISAAC BUCHANAN, M.P.P. FOR HAMILTON.

HAMILTON, C. W. :

PRINTED AT THE "SPECTATOR" JOB OFFICE, COURT HOUSE SQUARE,
1860.

DEDICATION.

"*Perissent les Colonies plutôt qu'un principe.*"—These words of Robespierre embody the principles of the British Political Economists.

"O Freedom! [freedom of trade] what crimes have been committed in thy name!"—*Madame Roland.*

TO MY CONSTITUENTS.

A work, suggested to me by the presence of such unprecedented distress, or want of employment, in the City of Hamilton, may most appropriately be dedicated to my Constituents; and they, I trust, will receive it as an evidence of my gratitude for their having so kindly stood by me, when, in 1857, I was attempted to be ostracised. The peculiar claim on me at the moment, to throw together these thoughts and authorities, was, that it seemed certain that, (overwhelmed by unforseen additions to the already too numerous calls upon me of private business,) I must retire from the Representation, as finding myself unable to continue to do justice to the public business for which I was elected. And I saw, also, that the sympathies of the whole Province could be elicited in favor of Hamilton, if the peculiar hardship of her case were generally understood, and if it were made clear how much it is for the interest of the Province that all municipalities be enabled to remain in the category of rising communities.

In pursuing my scrutiny into the cause of the distress of Hamilton, I could not overlook that, up to a certain point, she suffers in common with the Province, which is sufficiently proved by the fact, that the population that has left Hamilton has not gone to some other part of the Province, but to the United States. There no doubt exists throughout Canada (as there also exists throughout Britain and the United States, though in these countries, there is the temporary alleviation of large continuous arrivals of gold from Australia and California) a common cause of ever recurring monetary distress, the

direct effect of a bad, because unpatriotic, principle of legislation—our Provincial industry and our Provincial money market being perpetually overwhelmed by importations of British manufactures, quite disproportioned to our exportable resources. While our legislative violation of the law of supply and demand, in regard to the exportable commodity *gold*, (a five-dollar bill being made by law synonymous, or nearly synonymous, with a sovereign) violates the law of supply and demand in respect to our farm-produce, and all other exportable articles; as these cease to be exportable, (the exportation of gold being more profitable), the moment they are affected in the least by local prosperity, or become dearer than gold at its fixed raw material price.

And it became necessary for me to dispose, first, of the consideration of this legislative cause of distress which is common to the Canadas, (though, in Lower Canada, it operates little, from the Lower Canadians consuming comparatively few imported goods) whose effect on the body politic is the same as a tumour on the leg or any part of the body physical—the only thing for which is removal by the knife. The cause of the public distress alluded to is, that for the sake of Provincial Revenue, importations of foreign labor were, till lately, instigated by a Tariff not one half as high as that found necessary in the United States *for the protection of their currency*—and that foreign importations are still unduly instigated by our hard money system, *the effect of which is, that the foreign manufacturer is paid the same price in Cash, as the Canadian manufacturer in Trade or Barter*. Our law (by making a five dollar bill and a quarter of an ounce of gold synonymous) fixes the article, gold or foreign exchange, in *price*, and prevents it being *priced* according to its *value*, by the law of supply and demand, like the Canadian articles which have to compete with the foreign goods, (of whose cost that exchange forms part, just as does the freight and other charges on them) thus giving the latter (the foreign labor) an undue advantage in the race of competition, and unduly instigating importations—a course no more excusable, (no more good policy) in the government of a country, than if a municipal council, for the sake of increasing the money-means of the corporation, were unduly to increase the number of tavern licenses, thus making prodigal, and ruining, the individuals and their families on whom the prosperity of the municipality depends, thus, in a word, ‘killing the goose for the golden egg.’ If to run a Locality or Municipality into debt is to be prodigal, and if to run a country into debt is to be prodigal, that unpatriotic

process (our combined Free Trade and Hard Money System) is incalculably more prodigal, which at once deprives a population of employment in manufacturing their own clothing and implements, and runs them into debt for importations of inferior foreign labor. Even if there were truth in the delusive argument that our population would get nominally cheaper clothing from abroad, it could be shewn that they would lose more on the Wheat sent to Britain in payment, while as a matter of fact they cannot pay Britain at all in most of the productions which rotation of crops compels the Canadian Farmer to raise. But it can be shewn that (*passing beyond the delusion of nominal price*) the Canadian Farmer would get more for his 100 bushels of Wheat were the factory and the farm together. The freight and charges to Britain will reduce his 100 bushels to 75 bushels before it is sold in Britain, and to pay the freight and charges back to Canada, on the goods bought with this 75 (not 100) bushels, would reduce it to 50 bushels, so that even the British Manufactures were purchased for one half the price of Canadian Manufactures there would be no advantage in purchasing British goods, while at same time by doing so we would be to that extent reducing the employment of our own population. And the prospect for Canada, if shut up to European trade, would be much more gloomy than here represented. To see this, it is only necessary that we reflect that in the British market the Canadian farmer has to compete against countries in which the elements of price, (*the cost of labour and the cost of money are the elements of price,*) are one-half what they are, or ever will be, in America—and that labour (not to talk of the vastly different value of money) is double in Canada what it is in England, three times what it is in France, and six times what it is in parts of Spain, Germany and other countries, with whose untold quantities of wheat—under Britain's unpatriotic Free Import system, (for it is not a *bona fide* Free Trade system)—Canadian wheat will have to compete in the British market, so soon as they get roads to the sea-board.

Now, as in Canada we have no demand of consequence from a home, or manufacturing, population, our only alleviation, in the present, is the existence of the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. And how is it that we desire to continue the Reciprocity Treaty? Because the price for our *white* wheat is better in the United States than in Canada; and because we find there a better market than here for our coarse grains, our root crops, and our vegetables—the productions of Canada, for which we can find no outlet at all in

the distant market of Britain. And why is this? BECAUSE THE UNITED STATES HAVE A MANUFACTURING POPULATION, WHICH CANADA AS YET HAS NOT. The Canadian farmer should require no further proof of the necessity to him, *in the present*, of the raising up of home manufactures in the Province, and, *permanently*, of the American Zollverein proposed in these pages.

I find it out of my power to give sufficient time at present for the due consideration of the important suggestions I intended to make as to Canada's best course, with regard to her municipal indebtedness,—and as I am anxious, at the present moment, to call immediate attention to my view of the erroneous principle of our Monetary Legislation,—I have made up my mind no longer to delay the issue of these long promised pages. And by way of giving a greater prominence to this vital subject of our monetary legislation, I reproduce here the following paragraphs which will be found elsewhere in this volume:

“Every backwoodsman in America knows well the difference betwixt a payment by him in CASH, and a payment by him in TRADE, as he calls an exchange of one commodity in his possession for another which he wants. Practically he knows it to be the difference between prosperity and adversity, if not between honesty and dishonesty, to promise to pay cash which he has not, and cannot get, instead of promising to pay TRADE, or commodities of which he is possessed at the moment. And so should it be with the nation; but strange to say, Presidents of the United States in messages to Congress, equally with the Queen of England in speeches to Parliament, ignore this important difference. And the common attempt of the Political Economists is to conceal that payments in America to the *Foreign Merchant* are practically hard cash, (or *promises* to pay hard cash or specie which cannot be fulfilled) while payment to the *Home* manufacturer is practically TRADE, or an exchange of commodities in our possession, so that a piece of cloth purchased at home is already paid for in the national point of view, the currency being in no way disorganized, as occurs in payments to the foreign merchant by the removal of its basis, specie. All writers on the science (falsely so called) of Political Economy are guilty of circulating the common fallacy, that there is no difference between cash and Trade as a payment, whatever other fallacies may be peculiar to each writer. *And this indeed is the fallacy in our legislation from which flows all our distresses on this continent.*

“My object in giving such prominence to the foregoing is

that it points to the rock on which the hopes of every industrious family in the Empire, as well as in the Canadas and in the United States, has since 1819 been, and still continues to be, wrecked. And firmly convinced of this, I have long felt that if people could only be induced to reflect upon the monstrous practical evils which, individually and as a society, they suffer from the present state of our MONEY LAWS, an immediate remedy, through legislation, must be the philanthropic result. For thirty years I have seen, and, in season and out of season, explained, (generally to a very heedless auditory), that the practical cause of our being unable to cope either as a Province, as municipalities, as merchants, or as individuals, without our ever recurring monetary distress, is that it is originated and perpetuated by our Legislation! Our Legislation, in a word, makes the Banks and the Banks' note circulation the mere handmaid of the foreign trade; for all must admit that, seeing Bank Notes may immediately be converted into Exchange, nothing, under our Money Law, is a legitimate commodity for the Canadian Banks to advance on except it is exportable, and will thus bring back gold; and it follows, that *as the Banks are bound to pay in specie*, they ought to deal in nothing which in due time cannot be turned into specie, or, in other words, in articles whose sale abroad will fetch specie, and, IF THIS IS ALLOWED MY CASE IS PROVED.

"The object of this explanation is simply to endeavour to get Members of Parliament, as well as their constituents, to ask themselves whether this was the intention of the country in establishing Banks, and in establishing a paper circulation? There was a day in the Province when those Banks and that circulation did not exist. And was it then the intention of the people, in applying for these to the Legislature, that the result should chiefly* be to increase Foreign Trade, or more properly, to increase the importation of Foreign Labor, thus *beggaring the Province*? So far from this being the people's object, it was the result which of all others it was the interest of the Province to avoid. It is clear, then, that though they have been the best possible Institutions, and their paper circulation the most undoubtedly safe to the holder, the Banks have not realised the higher object which it is the interest of the Province they should subserve. They have been little more than Exchange Brokers, and they could not possibly have been anything else. For what purpose, then, it may be asked, was the establishment of Banks and of a paper circula-

*The other great use the Banks have been to Canada is that they have facilitated the moving to market of her crop.

ting medium demanded by the people? The purpose of the people in increased circulation, could only be INCREASED EMPLOYMENT TO CANADIANS. They had been told that the more money, there would be the more demand for Canadian labor, and (as a necessary consequence of more *bidders*) a greater *price* for it. It was, however, concealed from them that this law of supply and demand had already IN FACT been violated in the admission of the principle of the money law of Canada, in existence before the Banks were created, so that (as shown above) *firstly*, the Canadian Banks' notes cannot safely be advanced, except to parties who can sooner or later produce something convertible into Foreign Exchange—and, *secondly*, the increasing demand (that apparently greatest blessing to the producer) is not allowed to shed its benign influence in raising the prices even of commodities fitted for exportation! The Foreign Export Merchant, always having it in his power to exchange his Bank notes for gold near the price it will fetch abroad, will not take wheat or other Canadian exportable commodity at any higher price; and indeed from this price has to be deducted a margin to save him from the contingencies of markets, besides the freights and charges to the foreign market. *This perpetual inclination to the barest raw material prices for our exports* is a very serious consideration for the farmer, and would be still more so if the country, instead of importing on an average ten millions of dollars worth more than she exports, had the balance of trade *in our*. In such case, the price offered by the foreign *for our exports*, would be reduced, at least, by the rate of the Exchange he would get for his Bill of Exchange. *In this view, not as anticipating the likelihood of a state of things, but to show the absurdity of our principle, which, while it at all times debars the farmer from getting more than the price abroad for his produce (as shewn above), does not secure him even that!* It debars him from having the advantage of an adverse state of the Balance of Trade, such as we now have, and which would be indicated by an increased rate of Exchange when the extra premium would be an addition to the price of the farmer's produce (an immense advantage in settling his accounts,) while it does not secure him against the disadvantage of a favorable state of the Balance of Trade, which would be indicated (as the law now stands) by a decreased rate of Exchange, when *the reduction in the premium would be a reduction in the price of the farmer's produce*

exported. And if the law is to remain as it is, there is even the more necessity for the farmers protecting themselves through raising up a home market, in which they will always find themselves on equal terms with the parties from whom they draw their supplies.

"But it cannot be supposed possible that Canada will long be content to remain in this hopelessly degraded position industrially—about one-fourth of her wheat, (*of what the fly sparses,*) being taken to convey it to England, and about one-fourth being curtailed from the supplies got from England in return, so that the Canadian farmer taking the most favorable view of it, realizes about one-half the price the English farmer does! She, however, no doubt must so remain, until she repudiates the interference of England in her monetary legislation, and asserts for Canadian industry an independence of all influences external to the bounds of the Province. CANADA MUST HAVE A CANADIAN PRICE FOR GOLD AND SILVER, equivalent to the value of these in Canada, not in England—and the true way to establish this, is not to fix it *arbitrarily* as is done in England, but allow it to be regulated by the law of supply and demand, the same as all other commodities. *This same thing was proposed by the Directors of the Bank of England, to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in 1818. [See Appendix, page 164.]*"

The present Canadian Banks are Banks of Issue, and are admirable Institutions—far superior to any that exist to any extent in the United States—but, under our present currency law, their chief use is to facilitate the foreign trade, and to find better and quicker markets for our produce. And I may here mention that it has long been evident to me that if PRODUCTION and agricultural improvement are to get justice in Canada, we must originate a system of large, reliable, NON ISSUING INSTITUTIONS which we might call AGRICULTURAL BANKS, from which our farmers could get an advance to the extent of one third, or so, of the value of their real estate—which advance they might pay up at any time, but would not be bound to pay up till the end of a certain period, say thirty years—the borrower making an annual payment to cover interest of money, a sinking fund to provide for payment of the principal in thirty years, and a life insurance premium to secure his property being free from debt in case of his death before the loan is paid off.

And now, in temporarily closing this introductory view, it strikes me that some explanation of the position which I hold, and have so long persistently held, is called for, or at least may not be out of place. Every one knows that I was a member of the old liberal party of Canada in the days of the Union of the Provinces,—that by it I was made Representative of Toronto, the Metropolitan constituency, in the first parliament of the Union—and that, in this way, I had a hand in carrying through all our great Provincial Reforms,—Reforms which were consummated before some of those who are loudest in usurping for themselves a monopoly of the liberal name had arrived in the Province.

I subsequently found that, both at home and in the colony, the individuals now on the stage as Liberals had borrowed from ROBESPIERE his fatal doctrine which, for the greater prominence, I placed at the commencement of this explanation—*"perissent les Colonies plutôt qu'un principe."* They regard Government as a bundle of theories rather than as a Trustee of great national interests,—a conspiracy of men rather than an embodiment of party principles. *They will not recognize the employment of its own people as the first question in the Politics of every country, whether it is an independant country, or a colony,* but they make their primary questions things of secondary importance, such as forms of Government and questions as to the internal machinery thereof. These, at best, are only questions of machinery, or modes, or means. And they set entirely to one side the only question of paramount importance to the people, viz: *immediately and permanently to secure the elevation and independence of our own people's circumstances.* At the past periods alluded to, my mind was impressed (as it still is) with the feeling that it is of vital importance, both for the Mother Country and her Colonies, that these heartless theories in regard to our industry be abjured. But at that time a man was at once set down as a tory Monopolist who dared to profess patriotic views with regard to the employment of the people. And my mission on both sides of the Atlantic seemed to me to be to assist in rolling back this prejudice that had been created in the minds of the public—that a man's being patriotically anxious to protect his own country's industry was inconsistent with his being of the most liberal politics.

My industrial doctrines are, and ever have been, those conceived by the public to be contrary to my personal interests

as a foreign or importing merchant; and this has no doubt imparted to my efforts an influence, which parties equally honest in their convictions have not possessed, from their appearing to have an interested motive. I, however, have never urged a view based on any principle of monopoly. I have advocated manufactures for Canada as a means of keeping the money in the country,—this being the interest of every class in Canada—while at same time I have always believed this homely policy to be for the interest of the farmers particularly—this being the only way to secure them a home market for their produce. My object has not been to raise the wages, above the general standard of similar labor in the province, of the soap boilers, the paper makers, the cloth workers, the saddlers, the shoe makers, the implement or furniture manufacturers, or any other class in Canada. Indeed I have always shewn that our manufacturing all the articles, the raw material of which we have been in the habit of exporting,—*to receive it back in the manufactured shape!* would not raise their cost to the consumer even in nominal price to the individual, far less in actual cost to the province measured in the Canadian labor which must otherwise have remained unemployed, or have been less profitably employed, had it not been employed by the Canadian Manufacturer. I see, for instance, in Hamilton, we shall, under the present Tariff have 300 or 600, (where formerly we had 50 or 100) shoemakers, who, with their families, will constitute a large population, consuming Canadian Agricultural produce, —where formerly we sent money to New Hampshire for our shoes, a prodigal principal the application of which generally is what has periodically involved Canada in those outside commercial panics, which are and must ever be, inseparably connected with an extended foreign trade, where there is not a local, emblematic legal tender money which cannot leave the country as being of no use elsewhere.

I was the first to shew that the question of labor and the question of money are in reality but one question—the solution of the one being the solution of the other—and that the use of Tariffs is to protect the country's currency, while the use of Monetary Reform is simply to secure fair play to our Agriculturists and Artizans. And I was the first to point out that the great error of the Political Economists, or Free Traders, or Hard-money men, (whether as writers or speech-makers) is that they are, or affect to be, ignorant of

■
■

the vast difference (looking to the interest of the population) between our paying in *Trade* or in our own productions, on the spot and without any deductions for freights and other charges—which is what practically the home trade amounts to—and our promising to pay money to a foreigner—which in plain English means the giving away of a certain portion of our vitality—of that which the law has made the life's blood of all our local monetary confidence, or independant prosperity as a country. I can better express this in the words of the great American Economist, *Carey* :—

“We are, ourselves (say the inhabitants of the purely agricultural country) unemployed for more than half our time, and as regards our children, they are almost wholly so. Though unfit for the labours of the field, they yet could well perform the lighter work of tending the operations of a mill. Again the minds of our people are undeveloped. Let us have them taught, and in a brief time—obtaining machinists of our own—it may be, that we shall be enabled to teach those among whom we now must seek for knowledge. We waste, daily, the powers of earth and air, for want of little machines that would enable us to use them; we waste the faculties of our own people, because there is no demand for them; we waste their time and our own, for want of combination; we waste the major part of the products of our land in feeding horses and men who carry the rest to market—exhausting the soil because the market for its products is so distant. Let us, then, *once for all*, combine for the purpose of putting a stop to all this waste. With every step we make in that direction, we shall offer new inducements for carpenters and masons, printers and teachers, to come among us—eating the food that now we are forced to carry to the distant market; with each, the faculties of our people will become more and more developed—enabling us more and more to perfect the various processes by means of which to obtain command over steam and other natural forces. With each, there will be an increase of commerce among ourselves, attended by a diminution of our dependence on the foreigner, and an increase of power to command his services in case of need. The more numerous the differences among us, the more rapid will be the motion of the societary machine, the greater will be the economy of labor, the smaller will be the value of commodities, and the greater that of man.”

Now the British Statesmen of the present day, whose

knowledge of the Political Economy (which at best is merely a science of circumstances) is not practical, or of their own experience, but merely a *knowledge of what is written*,* insist on regarding, and would legislate for, the people as only *consumers*. They have tried (too successfully for the people's own interest) to convince the people that their whole interest is in *cheapness*, although to us, on this side of the Atlantic, it seems a self-evident proposition that the distinctive characteristic of the people is that the *labour*, and that *cheap* commodities, just mean *cheap* wages and *dear* money. We see that the great body of every people are *producers*, and have therefore as their main interest more bidders for their *labor* (which means *more* not *less* price for the commodity) for it is also self-evident that if a man's production did not exceed his consumption there would be no profit by his labor, and his employment would necessarily cease. The laborer's production being therefore the larger quantity, he is more interested in the price of it than in the price of the smaller quantity—his consumption. But it is well for Canada that she can afford to throw theories to the winds, having a certain unfailing barometer of her great interests. In her farmers, Canada has a great class, the prosperity of which secures the prosperity of all other classes; so that the *true economical policy for Canada is to promote the prosperity of the Canadian farmer*. And how this is to be done is the simple political question of the Canadian patriot. Yet—to the shame of British statesmen be it said—a question so momentous to Canada was known to have had no consideration in Britain, when she, in 1846, diametrically altered her policy, and repealed all the old distinctions between Canadian and American produce in her markets. The direct and immediate effect of this precipitate introduction of free imports (for it is not free trade) into the mother country was most disastrous to Canada, and was more likely to prove subversive of her loyalty than any thing that could have been anticipated; for it left the Canadian farmer (on the north bank of the St. Lawrence) only the English market for his produce, in which he has to compete (after paying all freights and expenses across the Atlantic) with wheat of countries where labor and money are (as I have shewn) much *cheaper* than in Canada, while it gave to the American farmer

* And let us consider what could be written a hundred years ago, of the circumstances of the present day.

(on the South Bank of the St. Lawrence) this British market to avail of whenever it suits him, in addition to the American market. Happily the British Government saw in time the error committed in bringing about a state of things in which it would have been impossible to retain, upon British principles, the Canadas—British principles always involving the idea that the object of Britain in acquiring or retaining territory is to bless, not to blight it. And Lord Elgin bribed the Americans by sharing with them our Fishery and Navigation rights, to give us the Reciprocity Treaty, which, while it exists, removes the Canadian farmer's cause of complaint.—Now, therefore, the preservation of this Reciprocity with the United States is shewn to be not only the interest of the farmers, and through them of all others in Canada, but of the British Government, as, without it, Canadians are left in a position to be much benefitted by Canada being annexed to U. S. I speak plainly, viewing him the most loyal man who speaks most plainly at such a crisis.

And this Reciprocity Treaty can only eventually be secured, and rendered permanent, by the British Government adopting the great principle of *decentralizing* the manufacturing power of the Empire—a principle which would aggrandize the British Empire, and be an incalculable benefit to the working classes in England, Ireland and Scotland. To preserve the Empire, Britain must, without delay, yield the selfish principle of *centralizing* which has ruined Ireland and India, so far as such countries could be ruined, and cost us the old American colonies. The principle of decentralizing the manufactures of the Empire is a principle which would secure for the *Empire* an enormous additional trade and influence. Through the instrumentality of some one or other of her dependencies (which might be called England in America—England in Australia—England in India, &c., &c.) she could secure Free Trade for all her mechanics that chose to go to these favored localities, with countries that could never agree to Free Trade direct with England, without giving a death blow to their comparatively comfortable populations. For instance, England could never get Free Trade with the United States in manufactured goods, but no doubt the United States would be prepared to extend the Reciprocity Treaty with Canada, thus throwing down all interior Custom Houses between Canada and the United States, which done, the Englishman, by coming to Canada, and manufacturing his goods at our endless water

powers, will be able to save the 25 per cent charged on the same goods going direct from England to the U. S.; and hundreds of mill-owners, now in uneasy circumstances in England, would, under such an arrangement, immediately transfer to Canada their machinery and hands to the infinite benefit of the population thus removed, and to the aggrandisement of the Empire. And this is the main thing wanted by the Canadian farmer, *permanently*, as giving him a market on the spot for his roots and spring crops, thus rendering rotation of crops possible, while it would give him also that which is so valuable to him *in the present* (until he gets his rotation of crops established), the superior market for his white wheat furnished in the United States by the Reciprocity Treaty.

It is quite clear that there is no way in which we can preserve the incalculable advantages we now enjoy under the Reciprocity Treaty, except by *extending the principle* and becoming parties to the American Zollverein which I proposed in my letter to the Political Convention which met in Toronto a year ago, and to which I have lately learned all parties in the United States would be agreeable. And this *great measure will be a fair compromise between the views of the two classes of friends of the Canadian farmer, one of which holds that our Farmer is to be benefitted by general Free Trade and direct taxation, and the other by keeping our money in the country through the restriction of importations and indirect taxation.*

In my opinion, there is no theoretical or even constitutional reform of the immense and momentary importance which this is. For I must now, (as I have ever been,) be one of those who insist on the simple doctrine, that DEVOTION TO THE WELL BEING OF THE MASSES OF OUR OWN COUNTRY, AS THE FIRST OBJECT OF OUR POLITICS, IS THE GREATEST REFORM AS WELL AS THE PUREST PHILANTHROPY AND THE TRUEST PATRIOTISM.

In the meantime, however, (as I elsewhere remark, and I have no leisure to put it into other language, even if I could express it equally well as is done in this quotation,) like all previous and probably all future Reformers, we have long been made to suffer the martyrdom necessarily the consequence of what at first appears to the world as "*the folly* of the truth*," a point which the celebrated Swiss, Dr. Vinet, so well explains in the following beautiful words:

* The French medical word *Folie*—insanity.

"Not only an opinion which all the world rejects, but a hope which no one shares, or a plan with which no one associates himself, brings the charge of folly, before the multitude, against the rash man who has conceived, and who cherishes it. His opinion may seem just, and his aim reasonable; he is a fool only for wishing to realize it. His folly lies in believing possible what all the world esteems impossible. * * * * *

"Many reason upon this subject as if nothing had happened since the day when God, looking upon his work, saw that what he had made was good. They speak of truth as if its condition amongst us were always the same. They love to represent it, enveloping and accompanying humanity, as the atmosphere envelopes and accompanies our earth in its journey through the heavens. But it is not so; truth is not attached to our mind, as the atmosphere to the globe we inhabit.—Truth is a suppliant, who, standing before the threshold, is for ever pressing towards the hearth, from which sin has banished it. As we pass and re-pass before that door, which it never quits, that majestic and mournful figure fixes for a moment our distracted attention. Each time it awakens in our memory I know not what dim recollections of order and glory and happiness; but we pass, and the impression vanishes. We have not been able entirely to repudiate the truth; we still retain some unconnected fragments of it; what of its light or enfeebled eye can bear, what of it is proportioned to our condition. The rest we reject or disfigure, so as to render it difficult of recognition while we retain,—which is one of our misfortunes,—the names of things we no longer possess. Moral and social truth is like one of those monumental inscriptions (level with the ground) over which the whole community pass as they go to their business, and which every day become more and more defaced; until some friendly chisel is applied to deepen the lines in that worn-out stone, so that every one is forced to perceive and to read it. THAT CHISEL IS IN THE HANDS OF A SMALL NUMBER OF MEN, WHO PERSEVERINGLY REMAIN PROSTRATE BEFORE THAT ANCIENT INSCRIPTION, AT THE RISK OF BEING DASHED UPON THE PAVEMENT, AND TRAMPLED UNDER THE HEEDLESS FEET OF THE PASSENGER; in other words, this truth dropped into oblivion, that duty fallen into disuse, finds a witness in the person of some man who has not believed that all the world are right, simply and solely because it is *all* the world.

"The strange things which that strange man says, and

which some others repeat after him, will not fail to be believed sooner or later, and FINALLY BECOME THE UNIVERSAL OPINION. And why? Because truth is truth; because it corresponds to every thing, satisfies every thing; because, both in general and in detail, it is better adapted to us than error; because, bound up by the most intimate relations, with all the order in the universe, it has, in our interests and wants, a thousand involuntary advocates; BECAUSE EVERY THING DEMANDS IT, EVERY THING CRIES AFTER IT, BECAUSE ERROR EXHAUSTS AND DEGRADES ITSELF; BECAUSE FALSEHOOD, WHICH AT FIRST APPEARED TO BENEFIT ALL HAS ENDED BY INJURING ALL; so that truth sits down in its place, vacant as it were, for the want of a suitable heir. Enemies concur with friends, obstacles with means, to the production of that unexpected result. Combinations of which it is impossible to give account, and of which God only has the secret, secure that victory. But conscience is not a stranger here; for there is within us, whatever we do, a witness to the truth, a witness timid and slow, but which a superior force drags from its retreat, and at last compels to speak. IT IS THUS THAT, TRUTHS THE MOST COMBATED, AND, AT FIRST, SUSTAINED BY ORGANS THE MOST DESPISED, END BY BECOMING IN THEIR TURN POPULAR CONVICTIONS.

"This, however, does not prevent all such truths from being combated, and their first witnesses from passing for madmen. At the head of each of those movements which have promoted the elevation of the human race, what do you see? In the estimation of the world, MADMEN. And the contempt they have attracted by their folly has always been proportionate to the grandeur of their enterprise, and the generosity of their intentions. The true heroes of humanity have always been crowned by that insulting epithet."

ISAAC BUCHANAN.

[UNFINISHED.—The continuation of the Dedication will present a short view of the policy which the writer believes can alone restore Hamilton, and other municipalities, to the category of rising communities, and render it possible for us to have permanent prosperity in the Province—all our past episodes of prosperity being rather in spite of than arising from the blasting industrial systems which Canada, as well as the United States, have borrowed from Britain.]